

CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM MECHANICS FROM THE UNIVERSAL POISSON-RINEHART ALGEBRA OF A MANIFOLD

G.Morchio

Dip. di Fisica, Università di Pisa and INFN, Pisa, Italy
e-mail: morchio@df.unipi.it

F. Strocchi

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy and INFN, Pisa
e-mail: f.strocchi@sns.it

(Received 2006)

The Lie and module (Rinehart) algebraic structure of vector fields of compact support over C^∞ functions on a (connected) manifold $\mathcal{M}$ define a unique universal non-commutative Poisson $*$ algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$. For a compact manifold, a (antihermitian) variable $Z \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, central with respect to both the product and the Lie product, relates commutators and Poisson brackets; in the non-compact case, sequences of locally central variables allow for the addition of an element with the same rôle. Quotients with respect to $Z^*Z - z^2 I$, $z \geq 0$, define classical Poisson algebras and quantum observable algebras, with $z = \hbar$. Under standard regularity conditions, the corresponding states and Hilbert space representations uniquely give rise to classical and quantum mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$.

Keywords: Lie-Rinehart algebras, Poisson algebras, quantization

1. Introduction and results

According to Heisenberg and Dirac, Quantum Mechanics is obtained from Classical Mechanics by replacing classical Poisson brackets, multiplied by the Planck constant, by commutators.

Two circles of problems arise from such an “ansatz”: one concerning the precise content of that prescription, which is not so well defined as it may appear, if it is to be interpreted as general and unique, and therefore independent from choices of coordinates, Hamiltonian, etc.; the second asking whether such a “substitution” has to be interpreted as a mere prescription or rather follows from more fundamental principles.

Concerning the first kind of problems, it is well known that the substitution procedure is completely well defined for a particle in euclidean space: when applied to cartesian coordinates and their conjugated momenta, it defines the Heisenberg algebra, which, assuming exponentiability of the generators, gives rise to a unique C^* algebra [1], the Weyl

algebra, with a unique Hilbert space representation continuous in the group parameters (von Neumann Theorem [2]).

The situation changes completely if one considers classical mechanics on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and asks whether a similar, coordinate independent, construction provides a unique algebra, with a similar classification of representations. In this case, geometrical structures play an essential rôle and different strategies and constructions have been proposed.

“Phase space” quantization methods start from the classical phase space $T^*(\mathcal{M})$ and try to associate an element $Q(f)$ of an operator algebra to any classical variable, i.e. any (regular) function f on $T^*(\mathcal{M})$. Requests which seem *a priori* reasonable are however found to be inconsistent: $[Q(f), Q(g)] = i\hbar\{f, g\}$, $[\ , \]$ denoting the commutator and $\{ \ , \ }$ the classical Poisson brackets, is in fact incompatible with $Q(g(f)) = g(Q(f))$, and also with linearity of Q , if irreducibility of the resulting algebra, or related conditions, are assumed [3].

Possible solutions are given either by restricting the correspondence Q to suitable subsets of the classical variables (“Geometric quantization”), or by relaxing the relation between commutators and classical Poisson brackets, which is assumed to hold to order $\hbar$ (“Deformation quantization”). In both cases, the construction depends on the introduction of additional structures, respectively geometrical and algebraic, and the result is not unique.

On the other side, “Canonical quantization” developed into an analysis based only on the geometry of $\mathcal{M}$ and of its diffeomorphism group, and therefore into the study of the representations of the crossed product algebras $C^0(\mathcal{M}) \times G$, G a subgroup of $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$, defined by the action of G on $C^0(\mathcal{M})$.

In the Segal approach [4], a maximality condition on $C^0(\mathcal{M})$ reduces the analysis to the representations in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$, with the Lebesgue measure.

In the approach of Mackey [5] and Landsman [6], $\mathcal{M}$ is assumed to be a homogenous space, $\mathcal{M} = G/H$, G a finite dimensional Lie group, H a subgroup. Given $\mathcal{M}$, the resulting algebra and representations (classified by the representations of H) substantially depend on the choice of G ; leaving aside the interest of the additional degrees of freedom associated to H , the construction does not therefore provide a unique formulation of Quantum Mechanics for a particle on $\mathcal{M}$.

Segal’s diffeomorphism invariant approach has been developed by Doebner [7], who dropped Segal’s maximality condition by assuming a local Hilbert space structure of any dimension, with a connection form which relates spaces at different points.

The representations of the diffeomorphism group, associated in general to diffeomorphism invariance, have been studied by Goldin. The corresponding Lie algebra of functions and vector fields does not contain enough information for the identification of mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$; in fact, it has the interpretation of the (classical) current algebra and its representations appear therefore in many situations, in particular for all N particle quantum (Schroedinger) systems on $\mathcal{M}$ [8]. The same considerations apply to the representations of the crossed product C^* algebra $C^0(\mathcal{M}) \times \text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$.

Clearly, the basic problem of the diffeomorphism invariant canonical approaches is the identification of degrees of freedom for the generalized momenta, which is not correctly given by the Lie structure of vector fields, since linearly independent vector fields define

independent variables.

The solution proposed in [9] is to consider as fundamental the module structure of the Lie algebra of vector fields of compact support, denoted by $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, on the algebra of C^∞ functions, i.e. the *Lie Rinehart* (LR) structure of $(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$ and to assume that the Lie-Rinehart product

$$f \circ v : (C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})) \rightarrow \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}) \quad (1)$$

is realized, in the algebra defining Quantum Mechanics (QM) on $\mathcal{M}$, by the *symmetric* (*Jordan*) *product*:

$$f \circ v = 1/2 (f \cdot v + v \cdot f) \quad (2)$$

It turns out that the LR relations (2) can also be written in terms of the resolvents of the unbounded operators representing vector fields (of compact support) and define therefore, together with the crossed product relations between $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$, a unique C^* algebra. Its Hilbert space representations have been classified, assuming regularity, i.e strong continuity of one dimensional subgroup of $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ as for the Weyl algebra, and shown to be in one to one correspondence with the unitary representation of the fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}$, describing the displacement of a particle along non-contractible closed paths [9]. Such a classification of states reproduces, only assuming basic geometrical and algebraic structures, that obtained by Doebner [7] and by [10], the latter within an approach *a priori* based on trajectories.

For the basic questions about the nature of quantization, clearly one has to identify general principles and ask to which extent they constrain both classical and quantum mechanics and which alternatives they leave open.

The strategy proposed by Dirac [11], with his analysis of “proportionality between commutators and Poisson brackets”, ends with the difficulties of phase space quantization. As we shall see, Dirac’s equations cannot be interpreted as directly relating classical and quantum algebras and the basic missing point is the very identification of the algebraic structures to which they apply.

We start therefore from fundamental principles, given by the geometry of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$. They are embodied in the commutative algebraic structure of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, describing the manifold, and in the Lie structure of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ defined by the Lie relation between vector fields and their action on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. From the above discussion it is clear that also the module structure of $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ over $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ plays an essential rôle, redefining linear dependence of vector fields according to multiplication by C^∞ functions.

Actually, the Lie-Rinehart algebra $(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$ is represented *faithfully* both in classical and in quantum mechanics, with the Lie product realized respectively as the Poisson and commutator brackets and the LR product realized as the symmetric product, eq.(2).

We then propose to base the most general notion of mechanics on a set of variables indexed by $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ with their Lie-Rinehart relations, C^∞ functions being interpreted as position variables and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, describing “small displacements”, as “generalized momenta”.

In order to obtain variables to which well defined values may be assigned in terms of a notion of spectrum, we consider (associative) algebras generated by them. The associative product is assumed 1) to extend the commutative product of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and 2) to reproduce, with its *symmetric (Jordan) part*, the Lie-Rinehart product between $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. to satisfy eq.(2); as discussed above in the case of QM, condition 2) has a basic rôle for the identification of degrees of freedom and therefore for the characterization of Mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$, with respect to the most general diffeomorphism invariant system. The use of *the symmetric part* of the associative product is essential in the non-commutative case.

We also assume 3) that the Lie product on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ can be extended to a Lie product on such algebras, defining on them derivations, i.e., satisfying the Leibniz rule with respect to the associative product. This may be interpreted as the association of some (infinitesimal) operation to each variable, generalizing the action of vector fields and allowing for a general notion of symmetry transformation (which is essential, e.g., for the introduction of a time evolution).

We extend therefore the Lie-Rinehart algebra of $\mathcal{M}$ to a *non-commutative (real) Poisson algebra*. In general, one obtains an enveloping non commutative Poisson algebra of a Lie-Rinehart algebra [12], a notion which extends that of Poisson enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra [13]. It should be emphasized that no relation is assumed between Lie products and commutators, only the Leibniz rule constraining the associative and Lie products.

If no other restriction is assumed, the result is the *universal* enveloping (non-commutative) Poisson algebra of the LR algebra $(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$. Its uniqueness follows from the definition of universality (see below) and its construction has been given in [12].

Such a non-commutative Poisson algebra will be called the Lie-Rinehart universal Poisson algebra of $\mathcal{M}$, or briefly the *Poisson-Rinehart* algebra of $\mathcal{M}$ and denoted by $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$. A unique linear involution is also defined (see Section 2) on $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, treating functions and vector fields as real variables, $f = f^*$, $v = v^*$ and satisfying $(AB)^* = B^* A^*$, which then implies $\{A, B\}^* = \{A^*, B^*\}$.

A priori, $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ is a very general algebraic structure, in fact the most general associative algebra, with a Lie bracket satisfying the Leibniz rule, generated by the LR algebra associated to $\mathcal{M}$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$. The main result is that it describes *nothing else than classical and quantum mechanics*.

This is obtained as follows: first, we recall that in general, in a Poisson algebra Λ , commutators and Lie products satisfy the following relation, already pointed out by Dirac [11] and rederived in refs. [13] [14]:

$$[A, B]\{C, D\} = \{A, B\}[C, D] \quad \forall A, B, C, D \in \Lambda. \quad (3)$$

Clearly, if for some $C, D \in \Lambda$, $\{C, D\}$ has an inverse, eq. (3) allows to express commutators in terms of Poisson brackets. More generally, the same holds for prime Poisson algebras, i.e. algebras without ideals which are divisors of zero [14]; such conditions are not satisfied by $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, since (see below) any pair of functions with disjoint supports generate (bilateral) ideals I_1, I_2 with $I_1 \cdot I_2 = 0$. However, in the case of compact $\mathcal{M}$, by

summing commutators of locally conjugated variables in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, we construct a unique variable $Z \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying

$$[A, B] = Z\{A, B\} \quad \forall A, B \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M}). \quad (4)$$

Z turns out to be central with respect to both the associative and to Lie product; in the non compact case, we construct a sequence Z_n satisfying eq.(4) for $n \geq \bar{n}(A, B)$, allowing for an extension of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ by an element satisfying eq.(4) and central in the same sense. In both cases, Z is antihermitian: $Z^* = -Z$.

If the variable Z is substituted by an (imaginary) number, the result may be seen as a precise version of an argument by Dirac, based on eq.(3), on the commutator prescription for QM; more properly, it shows that the general approach to mechanics on a manifold provided by the basic geometrical (LR) structure automatically yields a variable invariant under diffeomorphisms and under all the physical operations, expressed by the Lie brackets in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. a “universal constant”, with the same rôle and interpretation as the Planck constant.

To proceed with the analysis of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, one considers the ideals generated by $Z^*Z - z^2I$, $z \geq 0$, I the identity of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, given by $1 \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$; they are stable with respect to the Poisson brackets with $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ and define therefore homomorphisms π_z and quotient Poisson algebras $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})_z \equiv \pi_z(\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M}))$.

For $z = 0$, one obtains the commutative Poisson algebra generated by $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and by the C^∞ vector fields, with the natural module structure of $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, which is isomorphic to the commutative Poisson algebra of polynomials in the cotangent vectors on $\mathcal{M}$ with C^∞ coefficients; under standard regularity conditions (Section 2), it has a unique Hilbert space representation, by multiplication operators in $L^2(T^*(\mathcal{M}))$, with Lie brackets represented by the classical Poisson brackets. $T^*(\mathcal{M})$ arises as the spectrum, modulo a zero measure subset, of the commutative C^* algebra generated by C^∞ functions and exponential of vector fields.

For $z > 0$, $\pi_z(Z) = \iota z$, $\iota^2 = -1$ and there is an isomorphism φ , mapping the real Poisson involutive algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})_z$ into the complex algebra generated by $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and by the generalized momenta T_v associated to the vector fields of $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, satisfying

$$[T_v, T_w] = \iota z T_{\{v, w\}}, \quad [T_v, f] = \iota z \{v, f\}, \quad T_{f \circ v} = 1/2 (f T_v + T_v f),$$

with $\varphi(f) = f$, $\varphi(v) = T_v$, $\varphi(\iota) = i$. This is the (unbounded, “Lie-Rinehart”) quantum algebra introduced in ref. [9]. Its regular (i.e. exponentiable) Hilbert space representations were studied in [9] and shown to be in one-to one correspondence with the unitary representations of the fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}$, $\pi_1(\mathcal{M})$.

The analysis of Hilbert space representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ shows that the above classification is complete, i.e. Classical and Quantum Mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$ are the only *regular* and *factorial* representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ (Section 2).

The isomorphism between the real algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})_z$, $z \neq 0$, and the above complex algebra also explains the origin of a complex structure in the standard formulation of quantum mechanics, through a non-zero complex number representation of the antihermitian variable Z ; no complex structure arises in classical mechanics, which originates from the zero representation of Z .

For $\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{R}^n$, if only cartesian vector fields are considered, a similar simplified construction applies, still providing a Z variable and the above classification. The relevance of the full Rinehart structure is in fact only related to the geometrical identification of observables in a diffeomorphism invariant formulation (a question in fact at the origin the above mentioned difficulties and alternatives for the formulation of QM on manifolds).

In all cases, the Lie, or Lie-Rinehart, algebra of momenta and (functions of) positions is *the same* in classical and in quantum mechanics. The classical-quantum alternative only arises when *polynomials in the momenta* are introduced and is uniquely given by the values of Z in the universal enveloping algebra, with the LR constraint on the symmetric product.

The above analysis unravels the basic rôle of the LR geometry of the configuration manifold, which in the quantum case is somewhat hidden in the observable C^* -algebra (Lie products being identified with commutators) and in the classical case goes beyond the abelian algebraic relations. The LR algebraic structure provides, through the Poisson-Rinehart algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, a notion of *non commutative phase space* which coincides with that of a *general mechanical system*, exactly covering classical and quantum mechanics.

In particular, the above construction shows that the Dirac ansatz of canonical quantization, in the form of the proportionality of the commutators *of variables in* $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ to their classical Poisson brackets, has no alternative, within the above rather general notion of mechanical system.

The uniqueness of the commutators for C^∞ functions and vector fields on the configuration manifold also explains the obstructions which arise by requiring proportionality of commutators to Poisson brackets *for all functions* on the classical phase space. In our approach, the extension of the commutation relations starting from $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ and the construction of quantum algebras does not in fact use the classical Poisson algebra; it is given by the Leibniz rule and by the identification of the LR product with the symmetric product and therefore, in a sense, it *automatically depends* on Z .

Our results suggest a quite different approach to the relation between Classical and Quantum Mechanics with respect to phase space quantization: the classical phase space is *not* assumed as a starting point and rather arises from the same (non-commutative) Poisson algebra in correspondence with one of the values taken by the central variable Z , on the same footing as the quantum mechanical state space.

We also emphasize that in the above approach the Planck constant *needs not to be introduced*. It automatically appears as a variable invariant under all physical transformations, i.e. a *universal constant*, in the Poisson-Rinehart algebra of a manifold.

In the following Section the above notions will be formalized, together with their implications on classical and quantum mechanics.

2. The Poisson-Rinehart algebra of a manifold and its representations

The Lie-Rinehart algebra of $\mathcal{M}$.

A general notion of mechanical variables on $\mathcal{M}$, should include regular (C^∞) functions

and vector fields, indexing generalized momenta; as we shall see, local variables are enough for a general notion of Mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$. We therefore consider the algebra generated by real functions of compact support in $\mathcal{M}$ and the identity, $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, and the space $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ of C^∞ vector fields of compact support. $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ is a Lie algebra of derivations $v : f \rightarrow v(f)$ on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, with Lie product $\{v, w\}$ defined by

$$\{v, w\}(f) = v(w(f)) - w(v(f)) ; \quad (5)$$

its elements are integrable to one-parameter subgroups of the diffeomorphism group $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ by compactness of their support and generate a subgroup of it, $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$. As a real vector space, $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ is generated by an infinite number of linearly independent vector fields, which define independent variables; however, $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ is also a module over $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and, as such, it is locally generated by n vector fields, n the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. The module structure of vector fields over $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is clearly an expression of the functional character of the Lie algebra $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, to which a notion of linear dependence with functions as coefficients is naturally associated; clearly, it is crucial in order to describe the infinite dimensional diffeomorphism group and its Lie algebra in terms of a finite number of generators, which will be interpreted as independent generalized momenta.

All together, the above algebraic structures give rise to the *Lie-Rinehart algebra of $\mathcal{M}$* , $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$, defined [15] as the pair $(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$ with the commutative (real) algebraic structure of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, the Lie product in $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, the action of $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ as derivations and the Rinehart product $(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})) \rightarrow \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, defined by its action as a derivation on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$:

$$(f \circ v)(g) = f v(g) . \quad (6)$$

The Rinehart product is distributive in both factors, associative in the first,

$$f \circ (g \circ v) = (fg) \circ v \quad (7)$$

and is related to the Lie product by

$$\{v, f \circ w\} = v(f) \circ w + f \circ \{v, w\} \quad (8)$$

for all $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, $v, w \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$. The identity 1 of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies $v(1) = 0$, $1 \circ v = v$, $\forall v \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$.

The action of $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ as derivations can also be written as an extension of the Lie product $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ to $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, which becomes therefore a Lie algebra, still denoted by $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$.

$$\{v, f\} \equiv v(f) , \quad \{f, g\} \equiv 0 \quad (9)$$

for all $f, g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, $v \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$.

$\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ defines a group of automorphisms of the Lie-Rinehart algebra $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$. The action of the one-parameter group $g_{\lambda v}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, generated by $v \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ satisfies

$$(d/d\lambda) g_{\lambda v}(A) = \{v, g_{\lambda v}(A)\}, \quad \forall A \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}) \quad (10)$$

with the derivative taken in the C^∞ topology.

Non-commutative Poisson $\ast$ algebras.

As discussed in the Introduction, in order to obtain variables taking well defined values through a notion of spectrum, multiplications should be allowed and an associative algebra Λ should be considered. In order to preserve diffeomorphism invariance, see eq.(10), the Lie action of vector fields on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, should extend to derivations of Λ .

If the interpretation of vector fields as generators of a symmetry can be extended to all the variables in Λ , one is led to assume that their action is described by an extension to Λ of the Lie product of $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying the Leibniz rule, in both arguments as a consequence of antisymmetry. Substantially, this is the step advocated by Dirac by the introduction of *generalized Poisson brackets*, assumed [11] to satisfy the Leibniz rule in an associative algebra. Moreover, a notion of reality should be defined in Λ through an involution, leaving $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ pointwise invariant.

Λ should therefore have the structure of a *non-commutative Poisson $\ast$ algebra*. Non-commutative Poisson algebras have been formally introduced in refs. [13] [17] [14] [18]. They are real associative algebras, with product denoted by $A \cdot B$, which are also Lie algebras, with Lie product, denoted by $\{A, B\}$, satisfying the Leibniz rule

$$\{A, B \cdot C\} = \{A, B\} \cdot C + B \cdot \{A, C\}, \quad (11)$$

For a $\ast$ algebra, a linear involution must be defined, satisfying, as usual, $(A \cdot B)^* = B^* \cdot A^*$; the reality of the Lie structure in Λ also requires $\{A, B\}^* = \{A^*, B^*\}$.

No relation is assumed between the Lie product and the commutator $[A, B] \equiv A \cdot B - B \cdot A$; however, the following identity holds for all A, B, C, D in a Poisson algebra: [11] [13] [14]:

$$[A, B] \{C, D\} = \{A, B\} [C, D]. \quad (12)$$

The universal Poisson-Rinehart algebra of $\mathcal{M}$.

Following the above arguments, a general notion of mechanics on a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is given by the Poisson $\ast$ algebra *generated by the Lie-Rinehart algebra of $\mathcal{M}$* . More precisely, we consider the (non-commutative) *universal enveloping Poisson algebra* of the LR algebra $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$, defined as follows [12]:

DEFINITION 1. The **LR universal Poisson algebra**, or **Poisson-Rinehart algebra**, of a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is the unique (non-commutative) Poisson algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ with an injection $i : \mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying,

i) i is a Lie algebra homomorphism,

$$i(\{l_1, l_2\}) = \{i(l_1), i(l_2)\}, \quad \forall l_1, l_2 \in \mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M}), \quad (13)$$

ii) $i(1) \cdot i(l) = i(l), \forall l \in \mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$,

iii) $i(fg) = i(f) \cdot i(g) \quad \forall f, g \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\text{iv) } i(f \circ v) = \frac{1}{2}(i(f) \cdot i(v) + i(v) \cdot i(f)) \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M}), v \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$$

and such that, if Λ is a Poisson algebra with injection i_Λ satisfying i) - iv), there is a unique homomorphism of Poisson algebras $\rho : \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \Lambda$ intertwining between the injections, $i_\Lambda = \rho \circ i$.

As in general for enveloping algebras, the uniqueness of the Poisson universal enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ follows immediately from the uniqueness of the homomorphism ρ . In the following, $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ will be identified with the image of its injection in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$.

In order to construct $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, one may start from the Poisson universal enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ as a Lie algebra, introduced in general by Voronov [13] for (graded) Lie algebras, and take quotients with respect to the ideals (in the sense of associative algebras) generated by the relations ii)-iv); such ideals are in fact stable under the bracket operations with all the elements in the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ as a Lie algebra, and therefore the corresponding quotients define Poisson algebras.

The only delicate point in the construction of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ is the validity of the Leibniz rule *in both arguments* for the extended Lie brackets. In fact, the Leibniz rule on one side determines a unique extension of the Lie brackets to the tensor algebra of a Lie algebra. The Leibniz rule on the other side is obtained by Voronov through an explicit analysis of the quotient with the ideal generated by eq. (12). The same result also follows by imposing antisymmetry, through the quotient with respect to the ideal generated by all the elements $\{A, B\} + \{B, A\}$ together with their repeated $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ brackets with the tensor algebra; the Jacobi identity follows by induction. Injectivity of i holds since the above ideals have 0 intersection with $i(\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M}))$.

With respect to the Poisson universal enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ as a Lie algebra, $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ includes the relations ii) - iv), so that, according to the requirements discussed above, it extends the algebraic relations of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and the Lie-Rinehart product, identified with the symmetric (Jordan) part of the associative product.

Such relations are *a priori* essential for the mechanical interpretation of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ and will in fact be crucial for the derivation of the classical phase space and for the characterization of QM on $\mathcal{M}$. They also enter in the construction of the Planck constant as a central variable, even if conditions i) and ii) are sufficient for compact $\mathcal{M}$.

If, in Definition 1, only conditions i) is assumed, the result merely embodies the Lie relations between vector fields and functions on $\mathcal{M}$, so that it applies in general to $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ invariant systems; in particular, the resulting Poisson algebra appears in all N -particle systems on $\mathcal{M}$ [8], with $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$, as a Lie algebra, interpreted as the current algebra.

On $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ there is a unique involution which leaves $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ pointwise invariant; in fact, $(A \cdot B)^* = B^* \cdot A^*$ uniquely extends the involution from $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ to its tensor algebra, where it leaves invariant the ideals defining $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$; the involution is therefore well defined in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ and, by construction of the Lie brackets in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, satisfies $\{A, B\}^* = \{A^*, B^*\}$.

$\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ is a symmetry of all the above constructions and extends therefore to a group of automorphisms of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ as a Poisson algebra (leaving $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$ invariant). As before, the action of the one-parameter groups $g_{\lambda v}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, satisfies eq.(10), for all $A \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$,

with the derivative taken in the topology induced on $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ by the C^∞ topology on the tensor algebra over $\mathcal{L}_R(\mathcal{M})$.

It should be noted that $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ is not an enveloping algebra in the usual sense [16], since the Lie product is not given by the commutator. With respect to the commutative and non commutative Poisson algebras discussed in the literature [17] [18] for classical mechanics and for quantum mechanics, the concept of (non-commutative) Poisson universal enveloping algebra is more general and only includes the basic geometrical (Lie and Lie-Rinehart) structures. Its construction *includes neither classical nor quantum principles*, which are usually assumed in the form of abelianess or commutation relations.

The relation between commutators and Lie products.

A central result in our analysis is the construction of a variable Z which relates commutators and Lie products in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$. The essential ingredient is that any function of compact support, in particular the identity for compact $\mathcal{M}$, can be obtained as a sum of Lie products; by eq. (3), the corresponding sum of commutators gives the required variable, which is then shown to be independent of the construction and central, both in the commutator and in the Lie sense. More precisely we have

THEOREM 1. [9] *For a compact manifold $\mathcal{M}$, there exists a unique $Z \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, such that, $\forall A, B \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$,*

$$[A, B] = Z \cdot \{A, B\} . \quad (14)$$

It satisfies

$$\{Z, A\} = 0 = [Z, A] , \quad Z = -Z^* \quad (15)$$

For a non-compact manifold, there exists a sequence $Z_n = -Z_n^ \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ such that, $\forall A, B \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, $\exists \bar{n}(A, B) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that,*

$$[A, B] = Z_n \cdot \{A, B\} , \quad \{Z_n, A\} = 0 = [Z_n, A] \quad \forall n > \bar{n} . \quad (16)$$

One may therefore define an element $Z = -Z^$, such that the Poisson algebra $\tilde{\Lambda}_R(\mathcal{M})$ generated by $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ and Z satisfies eqs. (14), (15).*

Proof. The proof simplifies for compact $\mathcal{M}$. In this case, the manifold can be covered by a finite number of open sets $\mathcal{O}_i$ homeomorphic to discs. There are therefore functions q_i and vector fields w_i , with compact support contained (in local coordinates) in larger discs $\mathcal{O}'_i$, satisfying $\{q_i, w_i\}(x) = 1$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{O}_i$. For any partition of the unity $\sum_i g_i = 1$, with $\text{Supp}(g_i) \subset \mathcal{O}_i$, we have

$$1 = \sum_i g_i \{q_i, w_i\} = \sum_i \{q_i, g_i \circ w_i\} \equiv \sum_i \{q_i, p_i\} \quad (17)$$

Then, eq.(3) gives, for all $A, B \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$,

$$[A, B] = 1 \cdot [A, B] = \sum_i \{q_i, p_i\} \cdot [A, B] = \sum_i [q_i, p_i] \cdot \{A, B\} \quad (18)$$

The sum in the r.h.s. of eq.(18) is independent of the construction since, for any other choice of $\tilde{O}_i, \tilde{g}_i, \tilde{q}_i, \tilde{w}_i$, eq.(18) gives

$$\sum_i [\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{p}_i] = \sum_j [q_j, p_j] \cdot \sum_i \{\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{p}_i\} = \sum_j [q_j, p_j] \cdot \quad (19)$$

One may therefore define

$$Z \equiv \sum_i [q_i, p_i] \quad (20)$$

and eq.(14) holds. By definition of the involution in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, $Z = -Z^*$. By the Leibniz rule, $\forall A \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\{Z, A\} = \sum \{[q_i, p_i], A\} = \sum ([\{q_i, A\}, p_i] + [q_i, \{p_i, A\}]) ; \quad (21)$$

using eq.(14) and the Jacobi identity for the Lie product, the r.h.s. of eq.(21) becomes

$$Z \cdot \sum (\{ \{q_i, A\}, p_i \} + \{ q_i, \{p_i, A\} \}) = Z \cdot \sum \{ \{q_i, p_i\}, A \} = Z \cdot \{1, A\} = 0 . \quad (22)$$

Then, eq.(14) implies $[Z, A] = 0, \forall A \in \Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$. ■

Theorem 1 can be regarded as an answer to the problem raised by Dirac [11] about the origin and the uniqueness of the relation between commutators in Quantum Mechanics and classical Poisson brackets. Dirac introduced the notion of *generalized Poisson brackets* (substantially, the notion of non-commutative Poisson algebra) as the basis for a generalization of Classical Mechanics and argued that Poisson brackets must be proportional to commutators on the basis of eq.(3); however, the argument relies on the “independence” of C, D from A, B in eq.(3) and is not conclusive, since invertibility of $\{C, D\}$ is not discussed, and in fact the conclusion, even in the generalized form given by eq.(14), does not hold in general in (non-commutative) Poisson algebras. E.g., one can derive, for the universal enveloping Poisson algebra of a finite dimensional Lie algebra $\mathbb{L}$, the relation

$$[A, B] \cdot Z_1 = \{A, B\} \cdot Z_2 \quad (23)$$

$$Z_1 = \sum_{ij} g_{ij} L_i \cdot L_j , \quad Z_2 = \sum_{ijk} c_{ijk} L_i \cdot L_j \cdot L_k , \quad (24)$$

with g_{ij} the Killing form and c_{ijk} the structure constant of $\mathbb{L}$; Z_1 and Z_2 are central in the sense of Theorem 1, but Z_1 is not invertible and, in general, $A \cdot Z_1 = 0$ does not imply $A = 0$. For the Poisson-Rinehart algebra of a manifold, eq.(14) holds as a consequence of condition ii) in Definition 1 for $\mathcal{M}$ compact and from conditions ii) - iv) in general.

Moreover, Dirac’s analysis is not conclusive because it is unclear *to which algebra* it is meant to apply, so that the r.h.s. of eq.(14) is *not* well defined. If it is identified, as perhaps implicit in Dirac’s analysis, with the classical bracket in the *classical* Poisson algebra as a Lie algebra, leaving undetermined the associative product, one exactly meets the problems of *phase space quantization*. If it is interpreted in the universal Poisson enveloping algebra of the *Lie algebra* of functions and vector fields, substantial information

is lacking for the derivation of Quantum (and Classical) Mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$, as discussed above, and a conclusion can be obtained only in fixed coordinates, e.g. in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with cartesian coordinates (see below).

The Lie-Rinehart relations and the construction of the Poisson-Rinehart universal enveloping algebra, with the LR product identified with the Jordan product, is therefore essential for the relevance of eq.(14); in particular, the problems of phase space quantization are avoided since the construction of the classical Poisson algebra, also as a Lie algebra, depends on abelianess of the product, which does not hold in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$; in fact, the Lie algebra of functions on the phase space is *not* a common structure of classical and quantum mechanics, being given by a *quotient* of the common Poisson algebra $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$.

The non-commutative Poisson algebra generated by cartesian coordinates and momenta.

As discussed above, the rôle of the Lie-Rinehart relations is mainly that of allowing for the identification of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ with the algebra of mechanical variables on a manifold. If only $\mathbb{R}^n$, with cartesian coordinates, is considered, a similar simplified construction still yields a Poisson algebra with a central element Z satisfying eqs.(14), (15).

For its construction, it is enough to consider the polynomial algebra in the cartesian coordinates $x_i, i = 1 \dots n$ and the Lie algebra L_c generated by it and by momenta $p_i, i = 1 \dots n$ with Lie product

$$\{P(x), p_i\} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} P(x), \quad \{p_i, p_j\} = \{P_1(x), P_2(x)\} = 0. \quad (25)$$

No Rinehart product between coordinates and momenta is present, since only the vector fields associated to translations are considered. Then, Definition 1, without condition iv), gives a unique universal enveloping Poisson algebra Λ_c of L_c , extending the (commutative) algebraic structure of polynomials in the coordinates. The proof of Theorem 1 shows that $[x_i, p_i]$ is independent of i and defines an element $Z \in \Lambda_c$ satisfying eqs.(14), (15).

A non-trivial point is that Λ_c is not an explicit polynomial algebra; rather, it is uniquely determined by the requirements that i) it is a Poisson algebra, ii) it is generated by the polynomials in x_i and by the momenta p_i , iii) it is universal, i.e. for any Poisson algebra Λ satisfying i) and ii) there is a unique homomorphism $\rho : \Lambda_c \mapsto \Lambda$ acting as the identity on the generators.

The same Poisson algebra is also obtained if one only starts with the Lie algebra L_H generated by x_i, p_i and an element I , satisfying

$$\{x_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij} I, \quad (26)$$

all the other Lie products vanishing. One considers the universal enveloping Poisson algebra given by Definition 1, dropping conditions iii) and iv) and keeping ii) for I , i.e. with I as the identity. Then, introducing as before $Z \equiv [x_i, p_i]$ (i fixed) abelianess of the polynomials in x_i follows from eq.(14) and the result is again the Poisson algebra Λ_c .

Taking in Λ_c the quotients defined by the ideals generated by $Z^*Z - z^2$, $z \geq 0$ one obtains the classical Poisson algebra of polynomials in coordinates and momenta and the Heisenberg algebra, with $\hbar = z$.

The Dirac ansatz for commutators between cartesian coordinates and momenta has therefore no alternative, precisely in the sense that the Heisenberg algebra and the classical polynomial Poisson algebra are the only Poisson algebras which envelope $\mathbb{L}_c$ or $\mathbb{L}_H$ in the above sense (and are therefore isomorphic to quotients in Λ_c) and represent Z^*Z by a nonnegative number.

A more complete discussion of central variables and ideals in Poisson algebras requires the introduction of bounded variables, which can be conveniently constructed in Hilbert space representations.

Regular factorial representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$. Classical and Quantum Mechanics.

DEFINITION 2. A **representation** π of a Poisson $*$ -algebra Λ in a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a homomorphism of Λ into a Poisson $*$ -algebra of operators in $\mathcal{H}$, with both the operator product and a Lie product $\{.,.\}$ satisfying the Leibniz rule, having a common invariant dense domain D on which

$$\pi(A \cdot B) = \pi(A) \pi(B), \quad \pi(\{A, B\}) = \{\pi(A), \pi(B)\}, \quad \pi(A^*) = \pi(A)^*.$$

A representation π of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ is called **regular** if $\pi(C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M})) \neq 0$ and

- i) (**exponentiability**) D is invariant under $\pi(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}))$ and the one parameter unitary groups $U(\lambda v)$, $U(\lambda Z)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, generated by $T_v \equiv \pi(v)$ and $-i\pi(Z)$, respectively,
- ii) (**diffeomorphism invariance**) the elements $g_{\lambda v} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ define strongly continuous automorphisms of the C^* algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})_\pi$ generated by $\pi(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}))$, $U(\lambda v)$, $U(\lambda Z)$,

$$g_{\mu w} : \pi(f) \rightarrow \pi(g_{\mu w} f), \quad U(\lambda v) \rightarrow U(\lambda g_{\mu w}(v)), \quad U(\lambda Z) \rightarrow U(\lambda Z). \quad (27)$$

A regular representation π of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ is called **factorial** if the elements of the center $\mathcal{Z}_\pi$ of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})''_\pi$, the weak closure of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})_\pi$, which are invariant under $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ are multiples of the identity.

Condition i) requires the existence of exponentials of the representatives of the vector fields and of Z ; such exponentials are unique since stability of D under them implies essential selfadjointness of the generators on D . Condition ii) amounts to exponentiability of the derivations defined by eq.(10), in the representation π ; it is implied by i) for representations with $z \neq 0$ (as a consequence of eq.(29) below). The action of diffeomorphisms on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})''_\pi$ is well defined as a consequence of their strong continuity (condition ii).

The above condition on the center of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ reflects the fact that $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ has both an associative product and a Lie product, related to $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ by eq.(10), so that diffeomorphism invariance of an element corresponds, in exponentiated form, to the vanishing

of its Lie brackets with vector fields. For representations with $z \neq 0$, central elements are automatically diffeomorphism invariant, by eq.(29) below.

For the analysis of regular factorial representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, one has [12]:

PROPOSITION 1. *In a representation π of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$, $\pi(f)$ and $\pi(v)$, $f \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, $v \in \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$, are strongly continuous on D in the C^∞ topology of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$. Equation (10) holds for $\pi(g_{\lambda v}(A))$, $A = f, v$, with the derivative taken in the strong topology.*

In a regular representation, the one-parameter unitary groups $U(\lambda v)$, $U(\lambda Z)$ satisfy

$$[U(\lambda v), U(\lambda Z)] = 0, \quad [\pi(f), U(\lambda Z)] = 0. \quad (28)$$

In a regular factorial representation one has

- i) $U(\lambda Z) = e^{-i\lambda z} I$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$; modulo the $*$ involution in $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ (leaving $C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M})$ pointwise invariant), one can take $z \geq 0$,*
- ii) the one parameter groups $U(\lambda v)$ are strongly continuous in v in the C^∞ topology of the vector fields and*

$$U(\lambda v) U(\mu w) = U(\mu g_{\lambda zv}(w)) U(\lambda v), \quad U(\lambda v) f = g_{\lambda zv}(f) U(\lambda v), \quad (29)$$

For $z \neq 0$, eq.(29) defines, with the obvious modification of a factor z in the Lie algebra structure constants, the crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$ of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$, the universal covering group of $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ (the usual definition corresponding to $z = 1$). A regular representation of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ gives a representation of $\Pi(\mathcal{M})$ which is Lie-Rinehart regular in the sense of [12], since it is differentiable, the generators are strongly continuous in the C^∞ topology of vector fields and they satisfy the Lie-Rinehart relations.

We recall that two representations are called quasi equivalent if each of them is unitarily equivalent to a sum of subrepresentations of the other. Our main result is that the regular factorial representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ exactly define classical and quantum mechanics on $\mathcal{M}$, with z playing the rôle of $\hbar$:

THEOREM 2. [12] *The regular factorial representations π of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ are classified, modulo the $*$ involution, by the values iz , $z \geq 0$ of the central variable Z and*

*1) for $z > 0$, they coincide, apart from a multiplicity, with of the irreducible Lie-Rinehart regular representations of the crossed product $\Pi(\mathcal{M}) \equiv C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{M})$, defining **Quantum Mechanics** on $\mathcal{M}$. As a result of [9], for each $z > 0$, they are locally equivalent, up to a multiplicity, to the Schroedinger representation and they are classified by the unitary representations of the fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}$.*

2) for $z = 0$, for separable representation spaces $\mathcal{H}$, they are quasi equivalent to the representation π_C in $L^2(T^\mathcal{M}, dx dp)$, defined by multiplication operators (**Classical Mechanics**): on $D = C_0^\infty(T^*\mathcal{M})$, in local coordinates, $\forall f \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, $\forall v = \sum_i g_i(x) \partial/\partial x_i$, $\text{supp } v \subset \emptyset$, $\emptyset$ homeomorphic to an open disc,*

$$\pi(f) = f(x), \quad \pi(v) = \sum_i g_i(x) p^i, \quad (30)$$

p^i denoting the coordinates in the basis dual to $\partial/\partial x_i$. The Lie product in $\pi_C(\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M}))$ is given by the standard Poisson brackets on $T^*\mathcal{M}$. If $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{M})$ is unitarily implemented, the representation is unitarily equivalent to a multiple of π_C .

Proof. By i) of Proposition 1, $Z = izI$ in regular factorial representations of $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ and for $z \neq 0$ the classification follows from Proposition 1 and Theorems 3.7, 4.5, 4.6 of ref.[9].

For $z = 0$, by separability of $\mathcal{H}$, modulo unitary equivalence, the representation is defined by multiplication operators in a denumerable sum of L^2 spaces over the spectrum of the abelian C^* algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$.

The proof [12] then requires three steps: first, the spectrum of $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is identified, apart from a set of zero measure, with the cotangent bundle $T^*(\mathcal{M})$; in fact, by regularity of π , almost all the multiplicative functionals ξ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ are determined by their value on $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and on the generators $\pi(v)$ of the one parameter groups, to which they extend by regularity; locally,

$$\xi(v) \equiv \xi\left(\sum_i g_i(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\right) = \sum_i g_i(x_\xi) \xi\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\right) \equiv \sum_i g_i(x_\xi) p_\xi^i, \quad (31)$$

since $\mathcal{M}$ is the spectrum of the closure of $C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$; therefore, $\xi = (x_\xi, p_\xi^i) \in T^*(\mathcal{M})$ and

$$\pi(f) = f(x_\xi), \quad \pi(v) = \sum_i g_i(x_\xi) p_\xi^i \quad (32)$$

as multiplication operators.

The second point is the regularity of the above measures with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $T^*(\mathcal{M})$, which follows using transitivity of the transformations of $T^*(\mathcal{M})$ induced by diffeomorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$ (apart from a set of zero measure) and local coordinates defined (almost everywhere) in $T^*(\mathcal{M})$ by suitable vector fields on $\mathcal{M}$.

Third, the identification of the Lie brackets with the classical Poisson brackets on $\Lambda_R(\mathcal{M})$ follows, by the Leibniz rule, from its validity for $\pi(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$; from Proposition 1, one has, in local coordinates, $\forall A(x, p) \in \pi(C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) + \text{Vect}(\mathcal{M}))$, $v = \sum_i g_i(x) p^i$, $g_{\lambda v}(x, p)$ the canonical transformation defined on $T^*(\mathcal{M})$ by the diffeomorphism $g_{\lambda v}$,

$$\left\{ \sum_i g_i(x) p^i, A(x, p) \right\} = (d/d\lambda) A(g_{\lambda v}^{-1}(x, p))|_{\lambda=0} = \quad (33)$$

$$= \sum_i \left(-\frac{\partial A(x, p)}{\partial x_i} g_i(x) + \frac{\partial A(x, p)}{\partial p^i} \frac{\partial g_j(x)}{\partial x_i} p^j \right) = \left\{ \sum_i g_i(x) p^i, A(x, p) \right\}_{\text{Class}}. \quad \blacksquare \quad (34)$$

REFERENCES

- [1] Slawny, J.: *Comm. Math. Phys.* **24**, 151-170 (1971-72).
- [2] Thirring, W.: *Quantum Mathematical Physics: atoms, molecules and large systems*, Springer 2002.

- [3] Ali, S.T., Englis, M.: *Rev. Math. Phys.* **17**, 391–490 (2005).
- [4] Segal, I.: *J. Math. Phys.* **1**, 468–488 (1960).
- [5] Mackey, G.W.: *Induced representaions*, Benjamin, New York (1968).
- [6] Landsman, N.P.: *Rev. Math. Phys.*, **2**, 45–72 (1990).
- [7] Doebner, H.D.: *Rev. Math. Phys.*, **13**, 1–47 (2004).
- [8] Goldin, G.A.: *Lectures on diffeomorphism groups in quantum physics*, in Contemporary Problems in Mathematical Physics, Govaerts, J., Hounkonnou, N., Msezane, A.Z. eds., World Scientific 2006, pp. 1–99.
- [9] Morchio, G., Strocchi, F.: *Lett. Math. Phys.* **82**, 219–236 (2007).
- [10] Dürr, D., Goldstein, S., Taylor, J., Zanghì, N.: *Ann. H. Poincaré*. **7**, 791–907 (2006).
- [11] Dirac, P.A.M., *The principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Oxford Univ. Press 1958, Sect. 21.
- [12] Morchio, G., Strocchi, F.: arXiv: 0805-2870 [quant-ph].
- [13] Voronov, Th.Th.: *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, **29**, 196–199 (1995).
- [14] Farkas, D.R., Letzter, G.: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **125**, 155–190 (1998).
- [15] Rinehart, G.: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **108**, 195–222 (1963).
- [16] Dixmier, J.: *Enveloping algebras*, Amer. Math. Society 1996.
- [17] Flato, M., Gerstenhaber, M., Voronov, A.A.: *Lett. Math. Phys.* **34**, 77–90 (1995).
- [18] Dubois-Violette, M.: *Lectures on Graded Differential Algebras and Noncommutative Geometry*, in Noncommutative Differential Geometry and Its Applications to Physics, Kluwer Academic Pub. 2001, pp. 245–306.